UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/888,308	06/22/2001	P. K. Shiu	ADVI-01000US1	9546

23910 7590 09/22/2004	EXAMINER
FLIESLER MEYER, LLP	BLACKWELL, JAMES H

FLIESLER MEYER, LLP
FOUR EMBARCADERO CENTER
SUITE 400
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 09/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/888,308	SHIU, P. K.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**
	James H Blackwell	2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

> A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
> THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
> - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
>   after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
> - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
> - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
> - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
>   Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
>   earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>22 June 2001</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-38</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-38</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>22 June 2001</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/03/01</u>.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Independent Claims 1 and 35, and their dependent claims 2-19, and 32-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because they are directed to non-statutory subject matter. Independent Claims 1 and 35 are computer programs per se, and are not tangibly embodied on a computer readable medium. Claims 2-19, and 32-33 are also non statutory as they fail to correct the problem with Claims 1 and 35.

Independent Claims 20 and 36, and their dependent claims 21-31, 34, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because they are not in the technological arts as the claims are so broad as to encompass a pen and paper and a user accomplishing the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-13, and 16-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated

by Lakritz (U.S. Patent No. 6,623,529).

In regard to independent Claim 1 (and similarly independent Claims 20, and 35-

36), Lakritz teaches a manual language selection which overrides any automatic or

browser-specified language (Col. 21, lines 24-26; compare with Claim 1 (and similarly

Claims 20, and 35-36), *"... a user application, capable of specifying a language to

be used in the production of an output"*). Lakritz also teaches a template contains

placeholders for country and language-specific information that has been removed from

a document (Col. 6, lines 58-60). In addition, the template is an HTML document

containing tags (Col. 7, lines 21-23; compare with Claim 1 (and similarly Claims 20, and

35-36), *"... an application template, comprising a plurality of embedded tags"*).

Lakritz also teaches a term database (TermDB) that is an HTML representation of a

multilingual glossary. The glossary is built in the form of an HTML table. Rows in the

table correspond to entries in the glossary, be they words, phrases, or arbitrary strings.

Columns in the table correspond to individual languages in the glossary such as English, French, or German (Col. 27, lines 23-28). The TermDB is used with the Locale-independent Templates and the user application (see Fig. 5; compare with Claim 1 (and similarly Claims 20, and 35-36), *"... at least one dictionary with a plurality of entries, wherein each said entry of said at least one dictionary is connectively associated with said user application and said application template"*). Lakritz also teaches a Workflow Manager module, enabling a web site manager to orchestrate the creation of foreign language versions of the site and to automatically keep them synchronized and up-to-date, cost-effectively and with minimal effort (Col. 8, lines 64-67; Col. 9, line 1). Contained in this is a manager's Console, a Workflow pipeline, and a set of translation resources (Col. 9, lines 1-15; compare with Claim 1 (and similarly Claims 20, and 35-36), *"... a processing module, capable of accepting input from said user application and said application template, and combining data from the appropriate said dictionary to said input with produce the content of said output"*).

In regard to dependent Claim 2, Lakritz teaches that the TermDB, and the Templates both consist of HTML and hence contain tag identifiers Col. 27, lines 23-28), (Col. 7, lines 21-23; compare with Claim 2, *"... each said entry of said at least one dictionary is connectively associated with said user application and said application template through common language specification and tag identifiers"*).

In regard to dependent Claim 3, Lakritz teaches that documents may be Web based and non-Web based and may also contain non-text elements. The documents may contain or refer to additional dependent components such as graphics, audio, video, and other multi-media elements (Col. 9, lines 53-57; compare with Claim 3, *"... said data is selected from the group consisting of text, charts, diagrams, and figures"*).

In regard to dependent Claim 4 (and similarly dependent Claim 20), Lakritz teaches a manual language selection which overrides any automatic or browser-specified language (Col. 21, lines 24-26; compare with Claim 4 (and similarly dependent Claim 20), *"... a user of said user application is allowed to specify said language to be used in said output"*).

In regard to dependent Claim 5, Lakritz teaches that the invention automatically determines the language and country of a web site visitor and directs the web server to deliver the appropriate localized content in one or more country/language databases to the visitor's browser (Col. 2, lines 27-32; compare with Claim 5, *"... said user application automatically specifies said language to be used in said output"*).

In regard to dependent Claim 6 (and similarly dependent Claim 22), Lakritz teaches a template contains placeholders for country and language-specific information that has been removed from a document (Col. 6, lines 58-60). In addition, the template is an HTML document containing tags (Col. 7, lines 21-23; compare with Claim 6 (and similarly Claim 22), *"... said application template is constructed using Simple Server Pages"*).

In regard to dependent Claim 7 (and similarly dependent Claim 23), Lakritz teaches that using templates allows country or regional content to be conveniently separated from the structure of the document, thereby making it easy to change a design often by updating a single file. This in turn eliminates the ripple effect often seen when a single change must propagate through all of the localized documents on the site. This allows the Web Server (503) to control the locale-independent templates (504), language-specific elements (505), country-specific elements (506), and static HTML content (507) (Col. 7, lines 12-20; compare with Claim 7 (and similarly Claim 23), *"... design information separate from said content of said output"*).

In regard to dependent Claim 8, Lakritz teaches a Workflow Manager module, enabling a web site manager to orchestrate the creation of foreign language versions of the site and to automatically keep them synchronized and up-to-date, cost-effectively and with minimal effort (Col. 8, lines 64-67; Col. 9, line 1). Contained in this is a manager's Console, a Workflow pipeline, and a set of translation resources (Col. 9, lines 1-15; compare with Claim 8, *"... a software engine adapted to combine said content and said design information to create a dynamic real-time display screen"*).

In regard to dependent Claim 9, Lakritz teaches translating web pages from one language to another. These web pages are written using HTML (Col. 5, lines 41-49; compare with Claim 9, *"... said output comprises HTML code"*).

In regard to dependent Claim 10 (and similarly dependent Claim 24), Lakritz teaches that the template file tells the input manager which fields of the form should be

extracted. When the CGI script is invoked, the input data from those fields is saved and appended to the output, or .prt (pre-translated) file. This file also contains the time stamp, current country and language, and domain of the requester (Col. 37, lines 19-25; compare with Claim 10 (and similarly Claim 24), *"... a set of template files adapted to store at least a portion of said output"*).

In regard to dependent Claim 11, Lakritz teaches a Workflow Manager module, enabling a web site manager to orchestrate the creation of foreign language versions of the site and to automatically keep them synchronized and up-to-date, cost-effectively and with minimal effort (Col. 8, lines 64-67; Col. 9, line 1). Contained in this is a manager's Console, a Workflow pipeline, and a set of translation resources (Col. 9, lines 1-15; compare with Claim 11, *"... said data comprises translated language text"*).

In regard to dependent Claim 12 (and similarly dependent Claim 26), Lakritz teaches a document localization, management and delivery system. The invention utilizes an intuitive user interface for facilitating the localization of documents, data streams, and non-text files for multilingual Internet Web sites, enabling the Web site manager to incrementally update the language content of a Web site or document, thereby enhancing the maintainability and storage of multilingual electronic content. In addition, the invention utilizes a mechanism for automatic content insertion and delivery to Web site visitors (Col. 2, lines 17-27; compare with Claim 12 (and similarly Claim 26), *"... a web-based user interface adapted to maintain said translated language text"*).

In regard to dependent Claim 13, Lakritz teaches that human translators are linked to the Workflow Pipeline through a special Adaptor that connects to the Internet or a customer's intranet. This allows any translator, anywhere in the world, to join a virtual translation team and provide translation services to multilingual Web sites or any other translation application serviced by the invention (Col. 12, lines 48-53; compare with Claim 13, *"... a translator adapted to edit said translated language text"*).

In regard to dependent Claim 16, Lakritz teaches that the TermDBs are sources of external content (Col. 27, lines 23-28; compare with Claim 16, *"... additionally comprising at least one source of external content"*).

In regard to dependent Claim 17 (and similarly dependent Claim 28), Lakritz teaches a template contains placeholders for country and language-specific information that has been removed from a document (Col. 6, lines 58-60). In addition, the template is an HTML document containing tags (Col. 7, lines 21-23; compare with Claim 17 (and similarly Claim 28), *"... said processing module is further adapted to accept input from said source of external content to be used in producing said content of said output"*).

In regard to dependent Claim 18 (and similarly dependent Claim 29), Lakritz teaches a rules file consisting of a series of declarations and regular expressions that inform the parser what should be considered as translatable. For example, a typical rule that says "all quoted strings within a <script> tag should be translatable" would look like: begintag:: SCRIPT rule:: "(["]*)" endtag:: SCRIPT (Col. 7, lines 56-63; compare with

Claim 18 (and similarly dependent Claim 29), *"... additionally comprising at least one macro for expansion"*).

In regard to dependent Claim 19 (and similarly dependent Claim 30), Lakritz teaches a toolkit is provided which allows a master site to be built that is language and country-independent (Col. 2, lines 35-36; compare with Claim 19 (and similarly dependent Claim 30), *"... additionally comprising at least one support tool"*).

In regard to dependent Claim 25, Lakritz teaches user-defined TermDBs can be created and updated using the tpbuilder utility that comes with WebPlexer (Col. 28, lines 25-26). This implies that one could store and update the TermDB's with translated language information. Compare with Claim 25, *"... additionally comprising the step of storing translated language information in said at least one data dictionary"*).

In regard to dependent Claim 27, Lakritz teaches that the Workflow Pipeline uses a highly configurable architecture allowing a variety of Translation Resources to be instantly available to the Web site manager. These Translation Resources include both automated translation tools as well as human translators (Col. 11, lines 24-28; compare with Claim 27, *"... additionally comprising the step of maintaining said translated language text using a translator"*).

In regard to dependent Claim 31 (and similarly dependent Claim 32), Lakritz teaches that the Visitor module greatly enhances the multilingual Web site visitor's experience by providing an automated and seamless way to serve content in the correct language. Web site publishers can serve all their multilingual content through a single point of entry using the Visitor module. Web site visitors will immediately understand the

information they see when they enter a site because it will be instantly presented in their

language and for their country (Col. 3, lines 62-67; Col. 4, lines 1-2; compare with Claim

31 (and similarly Claim 32), *"... used in an online environment"*).

In regard to dependent Claim 33 (and similarly dependent Claim 34), Lakritz

teaches that the Visitor module greatly enhances the multilingual Web site visitor's

experience by providing an automated and seamless way to serve content in the correct

language. Web site publishers can serve all their multilingual content through a single

point of entry using the Visitor module. Web site visitors will immediately understand the

information they see when they enter a site because it will be instantly presented in their

language and for their country (Col. 3, lines 62-67; Col. 4, lines 1-2; compare with Claim

33 (and similarly Claim 34), *"...said output is at least one display page"*).

In regard to dependent Claim 37 (and similarly dependent Claim 38), Lakritz

teaches that the Visitor module (202) works in tandem with a customer's existing Web

server (203). It automatically determines the language and country of a Web site visitor

and directs the Web server (203) to deliver the appropriate localized content contained

in one or more country/language databases and/or file-based content in a file system

(204) to the visitor's browser (201) (Col. 4, lines 3-9; compare with Claim 37 (and

similarly Claim 38), *"... performed in real time"*).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lakritz.

In regard to dependent Claim 14, Lakritz does not teach that the *user application comprises a Java application*. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use Java since it was designed with the web in mind and therefore would have interfaced with HTML documents.

In regard to dependent Claim 15, Lakritz does not teach that *said Java application contains class definitions in at least one database*. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to store class definitions in a database since Lakritz's invention already stores other translation and rules information in external databases (e.g., TermDB). In this case, the benefit would have been to have a library of classes in a compact form rather than separate files containing a myriad of classes.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James H Blackwell whose telephone number is 703-305-0940. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H Feild can be reached on 703-305-9792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

James H. Blackwell
09/15/04

JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER